DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 322 864 HE 023 819

AUTHOR Gilbert, Melissa Kesler; And Others
TITLE The State of Assessment in Maryland: Responses from Postsecondary Institutions.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 22p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accountability; *College Outcomes Assessment; Consortia; Cooperative Programs; Educational Trends; *Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; *Measurement Techniques; Postsecondary Education; *Program Development; Researchers; *School Effectiveness; Staff Role; State Programs; *Student Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *Maryland

ABSTRACT

This study describes the state of postsecondary assessment in Maryland, identifies cognitive or noncognitive areas assessed, investigates perceptions about the role of the institutional researcher in assessment activities, and analyzes information to guide the formation of an assessment consortium. The paper serves as a case study of the types of assessments that occur on postsecondary campuses where state mandates are planned but nonexistent. A survey of 57 individuals responsible for learning/outcomes assessment resulted in responses from 24 individuals. Findings suggest that a legislative mandate without funds or guidelines lacked the support required to ensure compliance by all public postsecondary institutions. Mandates required by external agencies were critical to the implementation of assessment in specific areas. Three-fourths of the respondents indicated that their institutions either had or were developing a student assessment program. Most institutions were planning to measure cognitive skills and general education, were distributing results that described institutional effectiveness and professional and technical programs, and were undecided about measuring liberal arts appreciation. Academic administrators and faculty were more likely to be initiators, implementors, and recipients of assessment results, while institutional researchers described their roles as advisors and/or providers of information. Includes 12 references. (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

The State of Assessment in Maryland: Responses from Postsecondary Institutions

Melissa Kesler Gilbert
Learning Assessment Program, Goucher College

Helen Giles-Gee
Office of the President, Towson State University

Laurie Tripp O'Grady
Office of Planning and Research, Anne Arundel Community College

Jane Akers
Office of Institutional Research, Towson State University

ED322864

Please send all correspondence to:

Melissa Gilbert
52 Village Brook Lane, #20
Natick, MA 01760

HE 023 819

Running Head: STATE OF ASSESSMENT

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
MELISSA K. GILBERT

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

This article reports the results of a survey that evaluates the state of assessment in Maryland. Ancillary objectives of this study were: (1) to identify the cognitive or noncognitive areas to be assessed, (2) to investigate perceptions about the role of the institutional researcher in assessment activities and, (3) to solicit information that would guide the formation of a consortium focused on assessment. A proposed legislative mandate, lacking external funding, was not found to be sufficient impetus for the initiation of assessment programs. Institutions were more compelled to respond to requests from external agengies. Insitutional researchers were found to play a key role in the assessment process. The majority of respondents were interested in a consortium based on institution type.

The State of Assessment in Maryland: Responses from Post Secondary Institutions

In 1984, a survey of higher education institutions listed several deterrents to assessment. Many (71%) of the responding institutions reported having no funds to develop procedures while 64% were not clear about what to evaluate and 60% expressed some fear about the misuse of results (El-Khawas, 1985). However, three years later, Boyer, Ewell, Finney and Mingle (1987) reported that approximately 34 states had developed "formal" requests for assessment for their public institutions. By 1989, El-Khawas (1989) described a national picture of assessment using data collected from 366 postsecondary institutions. Close to 70% of responding institutions reported ongoing assessment activities with about 55% developing instruments for student-oriented assessment. There was a seven percent increase (34%) in the number of institutions which reported collaborating with other institutions on their assessment activities since 1988. To further illustrate the momentum of the assessment movement, the 1990 American Council on Education's national survey results indicated that 80% of the responding institutions had on-going assessment activities (Blumenstyk & Magner, 1990).

In many states, an institution's initiative to begin an assessment program has been not only tied to mandates, but also to the availability of funds specifically allocated for the development of assessment projects. El-Khawas (1989) reported that 40% of the total responding institutions admitted that their assessment efforts were developed in response to drives from external agencies such as state boards or accrediting bodies. Only 30% of the institutions surveyed were developing assessment strategies without external mandates. Institutions in Colorado faced a loss of as much as two percent of their budgets if assessment programs were not fully developed by 1990. The prospect of deficit funding caused Metropolitan State to consider charging students to recoup assessment expenses.

Without such charges to students, mandated assessment programs

might cause administrators to reallocate or divert funds from other campus programs. Certain states, such as New Jersey, Tennessee and Virginia, have practiced incentive funding to prohibit such a shifting of funds. Institutions in Tennessee have been eligible for incentive funds since 1979 if they could demonstrate quality. In 1987, the Tennessee Higher Education Commission established new guidelines which required students to take specific standardized tests. The scores of these students had to improve if additional funds were to be awarded. In contrast, South Dakota had also developed test-centered assessment procedures which were tabled in 1987 due to a lack of funds (The Chronicles of Higher Education, a & b, 1988).

Maryland institutions of higher education faced a similar situation to that experienced by South Dakota. In 1986, the Maryland State Board for Higher Education developed a plan to test sophomores in public two and four year institutions. The test would measure higher order general intellectual skills and/or the general education component of students' programs. The results of a pilot program were to determine if a statewide approach to testing should continue or whether tests should be tailored to institutional characteristics. This effort was tabled when the state did not fund the pilot program (State Board for Higher Education, 1986).

Clearly, the allocation of funds specifically earmarked for assessment and/or a state mandate requiring assessment provide strong incentives for the development of assessment programs. This fact raises the question of the types of assessment activity that have developed in states where neither funds nor state mandates about assessment had been issued.

Inasmuch as there had been no information collected at the state level that detailed assessment in Maryland, the primary purpose of this study was to describe the state of assessment in Maryland. Ancillary objectives of this study, developed to answer some questions of members of a Maryland Association of Institutional Research assessment group were: (1) to identify the cognitive or noncognitive areas assessed, (2) to investigate perceptions about the role of the institutional researcher in assessment activities and, (3) to solicit information that would guide the formation of a consortium focused on assessment.

Saupe (1990) suggested that the responsibilities of institutional research offices varied from planning and budgeting functions to assisting in the improvement of teaching and learning. Rogers and Gentemann (1989) evaluated the role of institutional research in a 1987 study of 167 institutions that would receive reaccreditation from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools between 1987 and 1992. Rogers and Gentemann found institutional research tasks in these institutions to be most related with assessment activities. However, numbers of institutions such as James Madison University, Western Michigan, Towson State University and Goucher College have established offices of assessment which are independent of Institutional Research offices. Given this fact, the role of the institutional research office in developing strategies for assessment was targeted for further study.

Rogers and Gentemann also determined that only 44% of the respondents had defined student outcomes on their campuses. Ory and Parker (1989) reported similar results from a telephone survey of 33 universities. Less than 20% reported assessing the gains in academic skills or in the major area as a result of the university experience. Most institutions that reported having some assessment activities mentioned mostly entry-level placement tests, ratings of instructors and courses, and alumni surveys. Therefore, though high proportions (80%) of institutions reported assessment activities to improve teaching and learning, there were few data on student outcomes to validate this claim. However, in 1990, the American Council on Education found that 94% of institutions with assessment programs were evaluating basic skills, 67% were assessing general education and liberal studies, and 62% were measuring students' progress in their majors (Blumenstyk & Magner, 1990).

This paper intends to serve as a case study of the types of assessments that occur on postsecondary campuses where state mandates are planned but nonexistent, and also to describe the other factors which may impede or drive assessment on various campuses. In addition, as the functions of institutional research offices may vary on many campuses, the information gathered by this study describes the roles institutional researchers may fill regarding assessment activities.

Methodology

In 1987, the Maryland Association of Institutional Research (MdAir) created an Outcomes Assessment Special Interest Group (SIG) to address assessment issues on area campuses. The SIG was to become the medium for achieving two important objectives: (1) creating a means for people from all segments of higher education to interact with one another, and (2) giving presentations and holding workshops during annual conferences. The assessment SIG began with only four members, but over the course of one year grew to approximately fifty members. The group was renamed the Maryland Assessment Consortium and new members were recruited from across the state.

In the summer of 1989, the Consortium decided to survey all institutions in Maryland on assessment issues. The purposes of our survey were three-fold: (1) to identify assessment activities in the state, (2) to mobilize institutions to join the consortium, and (3) to clarify the role of institutional researchers regarding assessment.

To construct the survey, members of the Consortium were asked to formulate survey questions appropriate for identifying assessment activities in Maryland. Approximately 25 fixed-format and open-ended questions were developed for the survey. In July, drafts of the survey were mailed to all members of the Consortium, who then edited the questions and provided additional suggestions.

The final survey contained four sections. The first section asked respondents to describe the institution's characteristics: i.e., type of institution, and full- and part-time enrollment. The second section dealt with assessment issues on the campus, such as who initiated assessment on the campus, why the assessment process was initiated, who was responsible for assessment, which students were assessed, what procedures were followed, and how the data were distributed and used on the campus. The third section asked respondents to indicate how far along they were in an assessment process within 31 identified areas. Respondents also could supply additional areas of assessment. The stages of assessment were described along a continuum that ranged from planning, defining, and measuring to

distributing results. Each of these stages was defined and one example was presented that described the assessment process at an imaginary institution. The final section dealt with consortium issues: (1) types of consortia of interest to the respondents, (2) the role MdAir should play in statewide assessment, and (3) types of activities of interest to respondents.

In September of 1989, 57 surveys were mailed to the president's offices of all institutions of higher education in Maryland. Each survey was accompanied by a self-addressed stamped envelope and a cover letter. The cover letter requested that the president pass the survey on to the person on campus currently responsible for learning/outcomes assessment. Institutions were assured of anonymity and promised a copy of the results.

A month later, follow-up calls were made to institutions to determine whether or not the institutions had responded and to encourage the institutions to reply if they had not already done so. A second survey was mailed when necessary.

Of the 57 surveys mailed, 24 were returned, yielding an overall response rate of 42%. The greatest percentage of our respondents were from public two year institutions. Private and public comprehensive institutions accounted for 21 and 17 percent of the responses, respectively. Graduate schools and universites each accounted for eight percent of the responses -- the number of private and public graduate schools and universities was equally distributed. Institutions were also asked to specify the number of full- and part-time students enrolled. Half of the responses were from institutions enrolling fewer than 2000 full-time students.

From our conversations with institutional representatives during follow-up phone calls, several reasons were identified to explain non-returns. The majority of non-returns were from larger institutions and state schools. Several institutions were in transition: they had a new president, a new institutional research director, or were currently creating an assessment office. Some institutional representatives were unable to locate an individual on their campus responsible for assessment. A few were unclear about the term "assessment". In addition, some institutional representatives said they were embarrassed to report that they did not yet have an assessment program.

Others simply did not view the survey as important: they filed it, or put it off past the deadline.

Maryland Assessment Programs: Results from Area Institutions

Development and Organization of Assessment Programs

The second section of the survey asked questions pertaining to the organization and development of assessment programs at area campuses. Respondents were asked if their institutions had, or were developing student assessment programs. The term "assessment" was not defined in the survey, allowing institutions to define "assessment" individually. Three-fourths of the respondents indicated that their institutions either had or were developing a student assessment program. The remaining 25 percent of the respondents indicated that such programs were absent from their campuses. If respondents indicated that they did not have an assessment program, they were instructed to go to the next section of the survey.

Respondents who indicated that they had developed or were developing a student assessment program were next asked how many years their student assessment plan had been in operation. The mean length of operation for student assessment plans was 4.8 years; the most frequent response, however, was three years.

Respondents were asked to specify who initiated the student assessment process at their institution, why the process was initiated, who developed the institution's assessment program, and who was responsible for implementing the assessment program. These questions were multiple response items in which respondents were asked to check all responses that applied.

The campus units most frequently cited for intitiating the student assessment process were faculty (39%) and academic affairs (39%) (see Table 1). Academic affairs was most frequently cited as having responsibility for implementing the assessment program (44%). Interestingly, because Maryland is under a state mandate to provide evidence of public accountability (Article-Education §11-304, 1989), only 11 percent of the respondents indicated that legislature was responsible for initiating student assessment.

Insert Table 1 about here

When respondents were asked why the assessment process was initiated, the most frequent response given was to address issues of accountability (61%), and the second was to respond to accrediting agencies (44%) (see Table 2). Campus committees or task forces were reported most often as the formulators of the student assessment program (71%) (see Table 3). Eighteen percent of responding institutions indicated that the institutional research office was responsible for formulating student assessment programs. Eleven percent reported that the institutional research office was responsible for implementing student assessment programs (see Table 4). However, 63% of the respondents indicated that an institutional researcher was involved in the assessment program development process primarily as a campus committee member (41%) and/or as an advisor (41%).

Insert Tables 2, 3, and 4 about here

Respondents were asked to identify what type of student testing procedures were currently in effect at their institution. Seventy-one percent of the respondents indicated that they used mandatory testing; the majority of these respondents noted that they were referring to required placement testing.

The final questions concerning campus assessment practices focused on what student populations the institutions planned to assess, how the assessment data were used on campus, to whom the assessment results were distributed and lastly, the impact of assessment results on budget priorities. A wide range of responses were given to identify the student cohorts the institution planned to assess. Common responses to this question included all entering freshmen and alumni.

Once assessment data were collected, the results were reportedly distributed to faculty (76%) and administration (71%), and were used primarily to improve teaching and learning (83%) and to evaluate programs (78%). In

terms of the impact that assessment results have on budget priorities, 53% of the respondents indicated that assessment results did influence budget priorities, especially in terms of resource allocation and strategic planning.

The Assessment of Cognitive and Noncognitive Outcomes

Seventeen out of 24 (71%) institutions responded to the assessment process section of the survey. Thirty-one assessment areas were categorized according to whether they were cognitive or noncognitive measures. The cognitive subcategory was further subdivided into skills, ability, competency, and knowledge. The noncognitive subgroup included measures of attitudes and institutional effectiveness.

To determine the appropriate subgroup for an area, definitions were developed. Areas within the cognitive domain were defined as follows: (a) cognitive skills -- intellectual processes of knowing; (b) ability -- an inherent or learned proficiency; (c) competency -- a developed or learned sufficiency; and (d) knowledge -- an awareness of information. The definitions of the noncognitive areas were: (a) attitude -- a feeling towards a person or thing and (b) measures of institutional effectiveness -- indicators which describe the degree to which an institution was successful in fulfilling its mission and goals.

Cognitive Domain. Cognitive skills included the areas of writing, reading, critical thinking, speaking, quantitative skills and problem solving. Forty-four percent of responding institutions were in the planning stages assessing cognitive skills. Speaking skills appeared to be the least desired area to assess with 48% of the institutions reporting, "Not Applicable". The Academic Profile, alumni follow-up and employer surveys were the instruments most often used to assess cognitive skills.

Respondents reported collecting data about general education, knowledge in the major, creativity, performance on national standardized tests, admission to graduate school, performance on licensing exams, and test scores for professional degrees. These indicators were categorized as measures of knowledge, competency, and ability. Most institutions (70% of those involved in assessment) were in the planning stages of measuring general education. Many institutions were distributing the results from

professional and technical programs. Instruments used included nursing, teaching, and other various medical licensing exams.

Non-Cognitive Domain. The subcategory of attitudes included the areas of political views; campus environment; awareness of moral issues and different cultures; different viewpoints; the collective appreciation of art, music, and drama; the appreciation of literature, science and technology, and socioeconomics. Compared to other subcategories, most institutions reported little interest in assessing moral issues, different cultures, political attitudes or tolerance of different viewpoints. Most institutions reported that they were distributing the results of a campus environment survey.

There was mixed interest in areas of appreciation of art, music, drama, literature, and science and technology. Most two year institutions were not interested in assessing these areas while some four year institutions were planning, measuring or distributing the results of assessment about appreciation.

Institutions reported using several methods to measure institutional effectiveness; namely, (1) alumni surveys, (2) community college enrollment reports, (3) employer surveys, (4) institutional research reports, (5) registrars' records, (6) Maryland State Board for Community Colleges' reports, (7) Maryland Higher Education Commission's Enrollment Information System data (8) state reports (9) graduation rates, and (10) retention rates. Many of these reports were developed by or produced for institutions for external agency reporting. Few institutions indicated assessments of admission to graduate schools or professional degrees. Both two and four year institutions reported that they were distributing results about institutional effectiveness.

Eight additional areas of assessment were supplied by respondents: interaction with others, personal growth and well-being, functioning in the work environment, professional development, freshman characteristics, personal development, stage theory, and personality type.

In summary, 71% of the responding institutions reported being in some stage of assessment. Most institutions were: (1) planning to measure cognitive skills and general education, (2) distributing results that described institutional effectiveness and professional and technical programs, and (3)

undecided about measuring liberal arts appreciation.

Maryland Assessment Consortium

The purpose of the last section of the questionnaire was to obtain information that would assist the members of the Consortium in further defining the role of an assessment group in Maryland and the role of institutional researchers in the assessment process.

Sixty-two percent of those who responded were interested in joining the Consortium and another 38% were not ready to join, but wanted to be kept informed. The majority (77%) of the respondents were interested in a consortium that was based on institution type, e.g., liberal arts, comprehensive, public or private two or four year institutions. Approximately one-third of the respondents were interested in discipline and/or skill-based consortia.

Repondents were asked to rank, in order of priority, the appropriate roles of institutional researchers regarding statewide assessment. Table 5 illustrates the rankings assigned to each role.

Insert Table 5 about here

One-half of the respondents reported sharing information and strategies about assessment as the number one priority of institutional researchers. Providing technical assistance about assessment was selected as a priority by 32% of the respondents. Less than ten percent of those who responded indicated that institutional researchers should develop assessment policy.

Over fifty percent of the respondents were interested in participating in assessment-related seminars, conferences, and Consortium meetings. The majority of respondents were also interested in receiving information, including a list of consultants, descriptions of assessment strategies, sample test instruments and newsletters.

Discussion

The 1988 legislation, Maryland Senate Bill 459, mandated that each public higher education institution in the state develop an accountability plan based on its individual mission. Senate Bill 459 required the accountability plan to include a clear statement of outcomes and an evaluation of those outcomes. Interestingly, only 11 percent of responding institutions indicated that their campus assessment programs were initiated in response to the legislation. It was also surprising that one year after the legislation was enacted, a quarter of the responding institutions reported that they were not yet in the development stages of establishing an assessment program.

The proportion (42%) of responding institutions was lower than expected given the passage of Senate Bill 459 and may limit the generalizability of the results. One reason for nonresponse centered on misunderstandings about the meaning of the term, "assessment". "Assessment" intentionally was not defined in the survey to permit individual interpretation. Unfortunately, the absence of a formal definition may have lowered the overall response rate to the survey. Follow-up calls revealed that some institutions did not return surveys because individuals who initially received the survey were unfamiliar with the term "assessment" and were unsure of the appropriate offices to receive the survey.

The question remains, did the lack of targeted funding result in an absence of outcomes assessment in Maryland? The lower response rate may suggest an answer: a legislative mandate without funds or guidelines lacked the support required to ensure compliance by all public postsecondary institutions. On the otherhand, the survey's results do suggest that institutions have completed assessments of those areas required by external agencies.

Results of the survey in the areas of assessment of cognitive and noncognitive domains suggest that external mandates have been critical to the implementation of assessment in specific areas. Institutions appear to be better prepared to respond to external agencies with completed reports than to address issues about which there were no requests for data. For example, survey respondents reported distributing the results of technical and

professional programs, such as nursing, which are regulated by accrediting bodies. On the other hand, most institutions were in the planning stages regarding the measurement of cognitive skills. In addition, responding institutions were disseminating assessment results, such as graduation rates, to state boards and commissions. In all cases, two and four year institutions listed reports that were required by external agencies as measures of institutional effectiveness.

The measurement efforts in noncognitive areas appeared to vary on the basis of institutional type and interest. Two year institutions were less likely to assess students' appreciation of art, music, and drama than responding four year institutions. Four year institutions with liberal arts based curricula may have more reason to focus attention on the measurement of cultural appreciation. Community colleges, on the other hand, may have greater interest in assessing technical and professional programs.

For the most part, institutional researchers in Maryland have been responsible for collecting assessment data and for developing corresponding reports. However, as institutions begin to measure additional academic areas within the campus, academic administrators and faculty may assume larger roles in the assessment process. Survey results support this hypothesis. While academic administrators and faculty were more likely to have been the initiators, implementors of, and recipients of the results of assessment programs, institutional researchers described their roles as advisors and/or providers of information. The survey results revealed that the primary uses of assessment data were for academic reasons: the improvement of learning, teaching, and program evaluation. Therefore, describing the institutional researchers' role in assessment as advisory rather than policy-making was both experiential as well as pragmatic.

Fitting with their roles as advisors and providers of information, institutional researchers indicated a need to obtain assistance about the kind of advice and information they could provide for their institutions. The survey results described the kinds of activities critical to institutional researchers involved with assessment programs.

In a state which provided few incentives to assess, the establishment of a

statewide assessment consortia appealed to respondents. Institutional researchers suggested that consortia could provide: (1) a forum for sharing information, (2) meaningful and interesting assessment-related activities, such as seminars and conferences, and (3) a means of sharing the consequences of various forms of student outcomes measurement at similar institutions. In addition, consortia should serve as clearinghouses for assessment-related material and consultants.

In summary, the survey results served as a baseline measure of the assessment activities that occurred on some Maryland college campuses during 1989. If accountability reports are firmly mandated by the Higher Education Coordinating Commission in upcoming years, it may be worthwhile to replicate this study to determine how campuses respond to internalize the assessment process.

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to acknowledge the support of the Maryland Association for Institutional Research.

References

Article-Education §11-304 (1989). Annotated Code of Maryland. Replacement Volume.

Blumenstyk, G. and Magner, D. (July 11, 1990). As Assessment Draws New Converts, Backers Gather to Ask 'What Works?' The Chronicle of Higher Education. A11.

Boyer, C. M., Ewell, P. T. Finney, J. E., and Mingle, J. R. (1987). Assessment and Outcomes Measurement: A View From the State. AAHE Bulletin, 39 (7):8-12.

The Chronicle of Higher Education. (July 20, 1988a). Diversity is Keynote of States' Efforts to Assess Students' Learning. A17, A25-26.

The Chronicle of Higher Education. (August 10, 1988b). 24 States Found to Require Programs to Assess What College Students Learn. A19, A23.

El-Khawas, E. (1985). "Campus Trends, 1984." Higher Education Panel Report No. 65, Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

El-Khawas, E. (1989). "Campus Trends, 1989." Higher Education Panel Report No. 78, Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Hyman, R., Jamison, A., Woodard, D., and Von Destinon, M. (1988,March). Preliminary Report: Student Outcomes and Assessment Survey 1987-88. Paper presented at the annual conference of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, St. Louis, MO.

Ory, J. C. and Parker, S. A. (1989). Assessment Activities at Large Research Universities. Research in Higher Education 40 (4):375-385.

Rogers, B. H. and Gentemann, K. M. (1989). The Value of Institutional Research in the Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness. Research in Higher Education 30 (3):345-355.

Saupe, J. L. (1990). The Functions of Institutional Research, 2nd ed. Association for Institutional Research, Florida State University, Tallahasee, Florida.

State Board for Higher Education (February, 1986). Maryland Statewide Plan for Postsecondary Education. 16 Francis Street, Annapolis, Maryland, 38-39.

TABLE 1.

Who initiated the student assessment process at your intitution?

(N = 18)

	N	%
Academic Affairs	7	39%
Faculty	7	39%
Statewide Board	4	22%
Trustees/Board	4	22%
President	4	22%
Student Affairs	3	17%
Other	3	17%
Legislature	2	11%

TABLE 2.

Why was the student assessment process initiated?

(multiple response)

(N=18)

	N	%
To address issues of accountablitiy	11	61%
To respond to accrediting agencies	8	44%
To facilitate insitutional planning	7	39%
To increase student success	2	11%
To enhance student learning	2	11%
To facilitate academic advising	1	6%
To respond to academic reorganization	1	6%
To better meet student needs	1	6%

TABLE 3.

Please identify the group or individual responsible for the formulation of your student assessment program

(N=17)

	N	%
Campus committee/Task Force	12	71%
Academic Affairs	5	29%
Institutional Research	3	18%
Student Affairs	3	18%
Faculty Committee	1	6%
University Senate Self-Study Committee	1	6%

TABLE 4.

Who is responsible for implementing the assessment program?

(multiple response)

(N=18)

	N	%
Academic Affairs	8	44%
Campus committee/Task Force	6	33%
Student Affairs	4	22%
Institutional Research	2	11%
Assessment Office	2	11%
President's Office	2	6%
Faculty Senate	2	6%

TABLE 5.

Ranked Assessment Roles for Institutional Researchers

1. Share information and strategies about assessment.
2. Provide technical assistance in the area of assessment.
3. Participate in a forum for assessment discussions or "like" institutions.
4. Evaluate and share information concerning consultants.
5. Consult with our membership.
6. Develop assessment policy.